UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/538,800	06/13/2005	Wilhelm Jorg	2034-100US	8804	
	25881 7590 10/30/2007 EPSTEIN DRANGEL BAZERMAN & JAMES, LLP			EXAMINER	
60 EAST 42ND STREET			NGUYEN, KIEN T		
SUITE 820 NEW YORK, NY 10165			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3711		
		•			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/30/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/538,800	JORG, WILHELM	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kien T. Nguyen	3711	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status		•	
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 Octoor</u> This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	•	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 18-33 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 18-33 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accent applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	vn from consideration. r election requirement. r. epted or b) □ objected to by the ledge of	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). sected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive I (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate	

Application/Control Number: 10/538,800

Art Unit: 3711

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 18-21, 23-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen U.S. Patent 4,550,456 in view of Tinus U.S. 4,685,738.

Allen disclosed a swing or cradle comprising a frame with four side elements (10, 12) and four connecting elements (14) (see Figs. 1 and 4); the frame is rectangular, can be suspended on four fastening devices (16, 18) on four connecting elements; the connecting elements (14) are bent tube sections with lower and upper half shelves. It is noted that Allen failed to teach the use of a plurality of interwoven band elements with fastening elements as taught in the claimed invention. However, such interwoven bands with fastening means are very well known in the art, especially in outdoor chairs and seats. For example, Tinus disclosed in Fig. 1 a chair comprising a plurality of interwoven longitudinal and transverse bands (12, 14) with each bands having fastening means (28) in the form of loops for fastening the bands to a seat frame (12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the fabric seat (4) of Allen with the interwoven bands as taught by Tinus for the purpose of increasing the durability of the seat while maintaining its flexibility.

Regarding various mechanical differences between the combination of Allen and Adams and claims 24, 25, 31, and 32, such differences are considered

Art Unit: 3711

obvious mechanical expediencies and can be used interchangeably or substitute with each other.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen modified by Adams as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Evans U.S. Patent 118,918.

It is noted that the frame of Allen does not show the side elements for curved as set forth therein. However, Evans disclosed a swing or cradle having a frame (a, c) with at least one frame element is curved forming a downwardly curved bearing surface.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the frame elements of Allen as modified by Adams with the curved frame elements as taught by Evans for the purpose of accommodating the shape of the user.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 18-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kien T. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4428. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eugene Kim can be reached on (571) 272-4463. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3711

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kien T. Nguyen/ Kien T. Nguyen, Primary Examiner Art Unit 3711

Ktn